DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 375 CS 503 795

AUTHOR Palmerton, Patricia R.
TITLE The Rhetoric of Opposing Constructions of Reality: Gay Rights in St. Paul.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Milwaukee, WI, April 15-17, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Civil Liberties; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Research; Conflict; *Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; Homosexuality; *Persuasive Discourse; *Rhetorical Criticism
IDENTIFIERS *Fantasy Theme Analysis; Minnesota (Saint Paul)

ABSTRACT

Fantasy Theme Analysis was used to examine the rhetorical clash of incongruent world views during the 1978 controversy over a gay rights ordinance in St. Paul, Minnesota. Fantasy Theme Analysis considers the individual and collective dramatizations of a group's goals, scope, and activities--the group's conceptualized reality, or fantasy theme--in evaluating the rhetorical effectiveness of the group. The three groups examined in this study and involved in the issue of gay rights in St. Paul were Citizens Alert for Morality (CAM), an antigay-rights group; St. Paul Citizens for Human Rights (SPCHR), a moderate group arguing in favor of gay rights; and the Target City Coalition, a "militant" gay rights group. Analysis of newspaper accounts, brochures, newsletters, broadcast materials, and advertisements during the controversies revealed the success of CAM over the other two groups. One of the strengths of the CAM rhetoric was the extent to which positions were justified within the assumptions of the vision. In the CAM vision, allowing civil rights for gays was a fault that could have led to total destruction of the vision. To fail to show how assertions fit within the context of the proffered perspective is to fail to show how the perspective can explain reality, hence to fail to create that alternative conception in an acceptable manner. It is in this arena that both Target City and SPCHR fell short. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215375

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Rhetoric of Opposing Constructions of Reality: Gay Rights in St. Paul

Patricia R. Palmerton
Dept. of Speech-Communication
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia R. Palmerton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the
Central States Speech Association Convention

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
1982

CS503795

The Rhetoric of
Opposing Constructions of Reality:
Gay Rights in St. Paul

In 1974, the St. Paul, Minnesota City Council amended the city's Human Rights Ordinance to prohibit discrimination based upon "affectional or sexual preference." Nearly four years later a group of St. Paul residents submitted a petition to the city clerk requesting that the Council adopt a new ordinance, excluding any references to gay rights. Thus began a rhetorical struggle culminating in a referendum in which 63% of those casting a ballot voted to repeal those sections of the ordinance referring to affectional or sexual preference.[1] In the campaign preceding this vote, both those in favor or and opposed to gay rights vigorously attempted to persuade non-aligned voters; the rhetoric associated with these attempts was the concern of this study. As one community addressing the controversy over the acceptance or rejection of gay liberation, the conflict in St. Paul offered a microcosm within which to examine the rhetorical clash of incongruent world views.

I became interested in looking at the issue of gay rights because I was interested in the rhetorical responses of individuals when they are faced with extremely diverse interpretations of reality. I wanted to study what happened in a rhetorical community when individuals are faced with another community whose interpretations of reality are threatening, shaking the very core of belief in "the way the world should be." The study of social movements seemed to be a place to start, with the focus on the rhetorical. There is far from consensus in our field as to what constitutes 1) a social movement, and 2) the rhetoric of a social movement. There is far from consensus as to whether rhetoric associated with what has been historically or sociologically

defined as a social movement constitutes a unique rhetorical form.[2] My approach was to look for a situation where the proponents of alternative conceptions of reality confronted each other rhetorically. I do not now claim that the situation I have chosen necessarily engenders unique rhetorical forms, nor do I have an answer for the debate on whether or not there is such a thing as a rhetorical movement. I do think such a study has a place and is of interest both for those wishing to study the rhetoric of social movements and for those who see such discourse as one example of rhetoric in a broader sense.

The gay rights struggle met my criterion of a major challenge to the traditional view of what society should be like. The emergence of a universe of individuals to whom same sex attraction and love are natural and desirable challenges the very core of a system which has a long-standing tradition prohibiting same sex acts. What was previously thought to be an aberration, practiced by "perverts" who were considered marginal members of society at best, has increasingly been shown to be an alternative conception of reality which a community of individuals holds quite apart from otherwise accepted social mores. The traditional point of view has been confronted with the presence of a social order which by its very existence proves the less-than-inevitability of the once accepted social reality.

In this study I analyzed the rhetorical struggle as it played itself out in St. Paul, Minnesota from January through April 1978. I reviewed any documents I could find, including St. Paul newspapers, brochures, newsletters, broadcast materials, and advertisements. I utilized the critical methodology of Fantasy Theme Analysis because of previous work indicating a relationship between rhetorical dramas and the development of a cohesive and widespread system of beliefs.[3] Because of this relationship one might expect that

rhetorical dramas would play an instrumental role in legitimizing a belief system under challenge, in communicating and engendering support for a new belief system, and in solidifying a changed world view.

It should be emphasized that Fantasy Theme Analysis does not imply studying falsehoods, nor fanciful meanderings in a world of make-believe. Any rhetorical rendering of actors participating in events occurring other than right here, right now, would meet the basic criteria for identification as fantasy. This rendering need not be fictitious, although it may be. The fact that individuals must reconstruct events rhetorically in order to communicate their experiences to others leads to the term fantasy. A criticism utilizing Fantasy Theme Analysis roughly focuses on any description of events, actions, or people in a context other than the present time and place.[4]

I identified three rhetorical perspectives regarding the issue of gay rights in St. Paul, each aligned with a specific group of people: that of Citizens Alert for Morality (CAM), a group in favor of repeal; that of St. Paul Citizens for Human Rights (SPCHR), a group arguing against repeal; and that of the Target City Coalition (also known as the Gay Survival Fund), a group identified as a "militant" gay rights group. My analysis revealed yet another perspective, that of a fourth unorganized group I call the Observers--those people who seemed to be watching the antics of the three other groups from a distance. The Observer rhetoric was mainly characterized by the lack of a clearcut stance with the liberal use of sarcasm and satire. This discourse expressed resentment at being involved in the conflict at all. There were definite differences in the extent to which each of these bodies of discourse reflected the use of fantasies, and there were definite differences in the extensiveness of the development of a rhetorical vision--an overall coherent

structured drama depicting an event, situation, or state of affairs. The rhetoric of Citizens Alert for Morality was far more thorough than any other discourse in developing a cohesive vision with extensive explanatory and legitimizing power. In this paper I will focus on the rhetorical perspectives offered by Citizens Alert for Morality, St. Paul Citizens for Human Rights, and Target City.

The rhetorical vision put forward by Citizens Alert for Morality (CAM) was characterized by the Rev. Richard Angwin, the primary persona associated with this group, as "light against darkness," a "battle between morality and immorality."[5] The CAM vision was an extensive rhetorical vision, including those persons for whom religious commitment was not a priority. The vision was cohesive and thorough. It legitimized the beliefs and actions of those sharing the vision, and it showed how those who might not agree with the underlying religious tenets could still support the denial of civil rights to gays. Although much of the CAM rhetoric had religious connotations, the vision was not dependent upon the rhetorical community sharing the religious themes within the vision. Indeed, as the vision developed, the religious themes seemed to act more as adjunct than mainstay within the total rhetorical world view.[6] The vision created and sustained in the CAM rhetoric portrayed the characteristics and motivations of individuals and groups in detail, vividly describing a world in which they were, or could be, living. In general, CAM rhetors described a world in which "goodness" was under attack by selfish, inconsiderate, powerful, thoughtless, and "indecent" people. Gay rights was a part of this attack, and the battle between "goodness" and gay rights came to represent a much larger struggle between order and chaos. This larger battleground remained in the background of this skirmish, however, as CAM rhetors cast the enemy--gays--as eroding the bases of American society in order to

achieve their own destructive ends.

Three main themes were mainstays within this vision: the tie to democratic institutions, the theme of seduction, and the theme of gays creating their own problems. CAM rhetors made a strategic connection to a valuable legitimization by emphasizing from the start the "democratic" nature of their actions. To oppose the gay rights ordinance meant standing up for American principles of democracy and religious freedom, according to CAM, the right to raise your children in the moral environment you choose. The ordinance was described as denying the chance for individuals to live by their chosen moral code, hence interfering with the fundamental right of religious freedom. In addition, this vision argued that the people's voice in government had been denied when the ordinance was originally adopted, because it had not been put to a city-wide vote (it was adopted by the City Council). CAM rhetors were therefore merely returning power to the people, upholding American tradition. It was important to make this connection with "democracy" regardless of its validity because it broadened the base of CAM's appeal. One did not have to be religious to support putting the ordinance to a vote, or to oppose the ordinance. One merely had to believe in the "right" of individuals to maintain their surroundings as their own moral code dictated. This idea was developed further in themes detailing the struggle for power and control between parents and gays.

A major theme in the campaign was that of "Parents' Rights." It was in this arena that issues of power and control were most fully developed. According to CAM rhetoric, parents and gays couldn't both have rights; it was an either/or proposition. Rights were seen as finite, with parents being depicted as having lost theirs time and again:

> Whose Rights (sic) are Wrong? Parents (sic) Rights or "gay Rights"? . . . Under the current ordinance: Parents have no right to refuse a homosexual's demand to rent a room or apartment in their home. . . . Parents have no right to oppose a homosexual as a worker in their community's child care center. . . . Parents have no right to refuse employment to a homosexual.[7]

"YOU CANNOT REFUSE . . ." "YOU CANNOT OPPOSE . . ."(emphasis in original). You, the voter were in essence gagged and bound by "immorality respected by the law" according to CAM.[8] Furthermore, you the responsible citizen were told you must come forward to help the parents and children victimized by this ordinance in order to "protect parents from being jailed for loving their children enough to protect them."[9]

In the CAM view, this fight over the control of the moral environment of children was the result of yet another fight, the fight to resist homosexual seduction. The CAM themes illustrated their claim that the ordinary person was a victim and powerless at the bidding of gays by focusing on the "plight" of children subjected to "homosexual influence." Allusions to homosexual influence flowed abundantly through the CAM discourse, although it was never clearly defined. Whatever it was, it was immoral, unworthy, scandalous, and strangely seductive. Gays would "influence the impressionable, pliable minds of children," predicted CAM.[10] Some proffered more serious charges, as gays were accused of sexually molesting children. Overall, however, the molestation argument was not emphasized.[11] Rather, the theme of seduction was developed in its stead, an even more compelling theme because of the subtlety involved. Seduction could be seen as much more insidious than molestation, for at least when one is molested one knows to resist. Seduction on the other hand, is so subtle that one supposedly doesn't really know what is happening. One can't or won't resist, and one may even come to like it. Children and society were

therefore in that much more danger. Within the seduction theme, gays could be attacked as being covert and deceitful, that much more powerful and dangerous because they hide their true aim. Gays were said to be out to "win over the minds of our young in their quest for recruits!"[12] Gays' powers of seduction were widespread, in the CAM view. Not only were they out to physically sexually seduce, but they seduced philosophically and politically, their victims ranging from political officials to the media, and even the "less wary clergy."[13]

The result? Social chaos, for the very foundation of our society would be destroyed:

> [T]he institution of marriage will go out of style and children will become strange creatures: unwanted and unloved. Our country cannot afford the spread of this disease which is destroying the fabric of the tradition family unit.[14]

Fighting gay rights was seen as "important to the survival of this country."[15]

Who were these people who were so powerful, so evil? One came to know them through the CAM descriptors. Gays were portrayed as extremely powerful, organized, deceitful, exploitive, demanding of special priveleges, inconsiderate, vicious, indecent, immoral, lawless, flaunting, seductive, and of course, perverted. These were the people being fought in the CAM vision; these were the people demanding civil rights.

One of the most powerful parts of CAM's argument dealt with the issue of civil rights. The CAM vision served to undermine the central thesis of the pro-gay position through its portrayal of the proper use of civil rights. Those arguing in favor of gay rights were accused of using civil rights as a "smoke-screen," "a vicious fraud" "devastating truth and logic."[16] The CAM vision predicted that gays would exploit civil rights if they were granted (the fact that they had already been granted four years earlier did not hinder these predictions). Civil rights for gays would merely increase their power,

already described as extensive in their supposed ability to seduce. "[T]he power turned over to the homosexuals is a cocked pistol at the temple of every moral and law abiding citizen," stated one CAM supporter. "Extending the hand of tolerance to the gays . . . ends with their hands at your throat," added another.[17]

Gays, CAM told us, don't need civil rights. Rather they want "special protection." In the CAM view gays had by their own actions created any discrimination problems they faced: "[A]n immoral person by his own action restricts his access to basic human rights."[18]

> If a person is discovered in a crime and apprehended, he no longer has full, unrestricted rights like a moral person. Because of his act of immorality he now has restricted rights. It is true of a thief, an adulterer, or any other immoral person.[19]

Gays themselves were portrayed as creating their own problem, by their own choice; because of their choice in the matter, civil rights did not apply.[20] Gay individuals further exacerbated their problem, said CAM, by "flaunting" and "manifesting" their lifestyle "upon" others.

> [T]here is no way that anyone . . . would be able to practice discrimination unless the homosexual flaunted his sexual orientation. . . . [I]f they kept their act private and their sexual preference to themselves they would have acceptance like any other citizen.[21]

"If the gays . . . kept their mouths shut, this issue would never have clouded the atmosphere."[22] In the CAM vision, gays choose to act gay, sexually and socially. Because of that choice--considered revocable--they must bear the consequences. In the CAM rhetorical vision the finger of causality was pointed directly at gay individuals for the ultimate breakdown of society and more specifically, for gays' own problems.

The theme of gay people creating their own problems was an important one, for it legitimized rejection of the primary assertion made by those upholding

the gay rights concept: that gay rights is a matter of civil and human rights. It provided a loophole for those unsure of the rightness or wrongness of a particular course of action. If allowing human rights for gays would result in the dire consequences predicted by CAM, then allowing the ordinance to stand as it was would not be the right thing to do. But if CAM's predictions were not accurate, then denial of human rights would be unjust. There was one out for an individual in this dilemma however: gays don't have to let anyone know about their sexual preference, even should they choose to act on it. Therefore, they will not be discriminated against, except by their own choosing. For those who accepted this portion of the CAM vision, there was a clear direction for action, a lesser-of-two-evils choice. The fact that this placed gay individuals in a paradoxical situation was never confronted.

There was no place for gayness in the CAM rhetorical vision. If one was gay, and chose not to tell anyone (to avoid discrimination) that person was indicted as deceitful, hence deserving of discrimination. If one chose to let it be known that one was gay, one was condemned for flaunting, also deserving of discrimination. The only choice for a gay person was to quit being gay. The only choice for a gay person or one considering giving support to gays was to accept the CAM definition of reality.

How did these "powerful, organized forces" respond in the context of this campaign? In two ways primarily, wich could conveniently be thought of as "moderately" and somewhat "militantly." The main organization visible in St. Paul which campaigned to retain the gay rights provisions was St. Paul Citizens for Human Rights (SPCHR), identified as a moderate organization. The rhetoric associated with SPCHR was very different from that of CAM. Whereas CAM made great usage of fantasies, SPCHR developed only a few creating a very weak scenario which cannot be termed a complete rhetorical vision. There was

little sense of a solid, coherent, cohesive picture of the situation from the perspective of these opponents to repeal.

For the most part, the argument of SPCHR followed a format of presenting specific facts denying the themes put forward by CAM. Ironically, some of the strongest themes in official SPCHR literature were explications of the vision offered by CAM, contrasted with SPCHR's factual denials:

> Won't equal rights . . . lead to destruction of the family unit? Don't parents have the right to . . . protect [their children] from teachers who promote certain lifestyles or who attempt misconduct with them?
>
> Gay and lesbian people are themselves family members and they respect family life. . . . Gay people have not used the ordinance to promote anything.[23]

The SPCHR literature developed few themes of its own. One of the strongest that did occur, however, dealt with the idea that pro-repeal forces were exploiting religious principles and religious belief, selling "hatred wrapped in the tinsel of righteous morality."[24] Along these lines, pro-repeal personae were depicted as arbitrarily applying religious principles to justify the denial of human rights: "Good grief, is that what they are teaching in the Christian churches of the 20th century? Leviticus also says that adulterers shall be put to death but nobody ever denies them housing."[25] The strength of this theme may be one reason CAM forces chose to develop their vision primarily along non-religious lines.

In developing the non-religious arguments, SPCHR relied heavily upon the passive voice. Things were described as done with people seldom implicated in doing them. If the active voice was used, the primary actors were referred to only vaguely: "a small group," "a certain group," "some people." "Fears" set Americans against Americans, not people. The "rights of homosexuals" were said to <u>be</u> abrogated. The SPCHR rhetoric seldom identified who exactly was

doing the abrogating. Nevertheless, an overall picture of the opponents to gay rights emerged, even if one had little idea of who those opponents actually were. Pro-repeal forces were described by SPCHR as exploiting fears and ignorance, appealing to people's baser emotions through intentionally misleading them. They were accused of distorting the situation, putting out "twisted trash" in an effort to garner votes.[26] Even more clearly, the SPCHR discourse depicted the opposition as well-intended. The hatred, fear, distortion, and even the attempts to mislead and exploit religion could all be understood if one remembered that repeal supporters were only acting irrationally and fearfully because of thier own misconceptions and ignorance.[27] Pro-repeal individuals were portrayed in the SPCHR rhetoric as basically good, their misunderstanding leading to their oppressive actions. Pro-repeal actors received the benefit of the doubt time and again. In contrast, gay supporters received little support for their motivations, other than occasional descriptions that they were sensitive, caring, knowledgeable, fair-minded or open-minded. It seemed that SPCHR put a high priority on acting out the image of fair-mindedness, but neglected to describe it for the benefit of themselves and others. They provided little positive image of gays, offering little to counter the extremely negative characterization put forward by CAM.

The SPCHR rhetoric concentrated upon the proposition that discrimination is wrong, a belief that provided the foundation for almost the entire argument put forward by SPCHR. Gay people were described as no different from other people, hence discrimination against gays was considered no different from discrimination against anyone else. Over and over SPCHR voiced the belief that discrimination is wrong in any sense of the word, with the American tradition of civil rights providing the justification for the plea to maintain the protection for gay people. If you agreed with civil rights, then according

to SPCHR rhetors you should agree with gay rights. SPCHR consistently reiterated the claim that belief in civil rights equalled belief in gay rights, with little explanation of the validity of the relationship. The requisite connection between civil rights and gay rights seemed obvious for those supporting gay rights, but SPCHR rhetors did not make it clear for those who might question its validity. The rhetoric of SPCHR never contended with the reservation placed upon that connection by repeal supporters: gays have a choice.

The third rhetorical perspective was that associated with Target City, a group that was seen as a more militant or radical gay faction. Almost the entire Target City public communication concerning the repeal fight was generated by Robert Kunst, a gay activist from Florida (Dade County) who came to St. Paul to help with the campaign. The perspective offered by Target City and Kunst did not seem to be widely shared, but it was widely publicized. It was characterized by a great deal of dramatization, with several themes being introduced which could eventually have contributed to a wider rhetorical vision. This rhetoric was substantially different from that of SPCHR with much stronger development of the pro-repeal character as well as greater attribution of negative motives to pro-repeal forces. CAM supporters were portrayed as "fanatics," and "religious persecutionists," typical of those who create problems for society.[28] Those individuals wishing to deny civil rights to gays were described as well-organized, national, hypocritical, and using religion for their own purposes. In the Target City view, CAM supporters were applying standards to gays which were not applied to the heterosexual population, in part because CAM supporters could not "handle themselves" sexually. In contrast, Target City described gays as victims of a society in which they are exploited. They take much undue blame

because of their inability to defend themselves to avoid the accusation of "flaunting." Gays were scapegoats in this view, the conflict a symbolic one wherein the fight against gays really represented a fight against anyone who is different. Ultimately society would be the victim, said Target City, for repeal of rights for gays would merely reinforce detrimental societal attitudes, values, and priorities justifying "hate and sexism."[29]

The differences in the approaches of SPCHR and of Target City and Kunst became a point of interest for many, and the "split" between members of the gay community was often discussed in the communication surrounding the entire campaign. The much publicized animosity between the two groups was often referred to as a "power struggle," a characterization which provided support for CAM's assertions that gays are power-hungry.[30] Furthermore, the accusations SPCHR and Target City rhetors directed at each other reinforced a negative conception of gay individuals. Kunst called SPCHR "amateurish" and "incredibly naive," using Kunst as a "scapegoat" for a failing campaign and ultimately "sabotaging" the cause.[31] SPCHR called Kunst a "power-hungry ego-maniac," an outsider and "attention-getter" only "damaging the campaign."[32] By attacking the work of SPCHR, Kunst led the way for the subsequent descriptions of a power struggle amid the gay community. In addition, in disavowing the competence and legitimacy of SPCHR Kunst also contributed to the degradation of the character of gays generally. In accusing other gays of sabotage, the Kunst rhetoric strengthened the notion of gays maneuvering for power and control, reinforcing the CAM interpretation. Likewise, SPCHR's strong negative reaction to Kunst reinforced the CAM view of gay people. SPCHR rhetors showed decidedly more understanding and respect for those supporting CAM than for Target City supporters. By picturing Kunst as an enemy with selfish and harmful motives, SPCHR reinforced the CAM characterization of the flaunting,

manipulative, controlling homosexual whom even like-minded people could not control. By failing to characterize Kunst's motives as respectable and good while disavowing his methods, SPCHR pointed the way for the rejection of the entire gay community, contrasting the negative motives of gays with the positive ones of CAM supporters. Even Kunst, in vilifying SPCHR rhetors did not set up such a stark contrast, for in the Target City view the motives of CAM supporters were unquestionably base.

Both Target City and SPCHR showed a profound dependence upon the legitimization given by an American tradition of civil rights for all. Both groups based their anti-discrimination arguments upon an underlying assumption that gays did not need to justify their membership as a legitimate minority group. This, despite the fact that early in the campaign CAM had effectively neutralized the validity of such a classification by emphasizing what CAM claimed was a major difference between gays and other minority groups choice. By not dealing with the issue of choice, anti-repeal rhetors implied that it was an unanswerable argument; no amount of assertion that gays should not be subjected to discrimination would persuade that they were not a population <u>deserving</u> of discrimination. In the CAM view, discrimination against gays was a necessary exercise of discretion. In refusing to consider the controversy one of a civil rights nature, and in justifying such a refusal in its vision, CAM removed the foundations of SPCHR's argument and all but a few competing themes in Target City's discourse.

One cannot validly generalize to all campaigns against gay rights outside of St. Paul, but the elements of the CAM vision deserve scrutiny as do the mistakes made by those opposing that vision. Both may bear similarities to conflicts outside of the St. Paul community regarding

issues of gay rights, and perhaps issues of sexuality generally.[33] Certainly placing the blame upon the victim because he or she "asked for it" rings familiar when considering cases of heterosexual rape in which the attacker has been freed and the victim chastised. Those elements of the CAM vision which seemed to hold the most persuasive potential in the St. Paul fight, the theme of power and control and the theme of bearing responsibility for one's own misfortune, deserve consideration when evaluating discourse surrounding issues of sexuality, and rhetoric justifying denial of civil rights of any kind.

Ernest G. Bormann has stated that "a viable rhetorical vision accounts plausibly for the evidence of the senses so those who pick up the dramatic action and find it personally satisfying are not troubled by contradictory evidence from commonsense experience."[34] The vision provides a way of making sense of otherwise conflicting phenomena, justifying interpretations of these phenomena and legitimizing the reality it represents. In examining the perspectives put forward by the three groups identified here, only the vision offered by CAM was able to successfully delegitimize contrary evidence through reinterpreting its significance in the context of the CAM reality. The predominantly deliberative approach of SPCHR did not account for the damaging interpretations created by CAM because it did not show how a world view containing SPCHR's premises could exist without devastating the foundations of the world-as-we-know-it described by CAM. Neither SPCHR nor Target City provided rhetorical perspectives in which same sex sexual preference exercised by some members of society could co-exist with the vision put forward by CAM. Furthermore, neither provided an alternative to CAM's vision in which society could be

seen to be functioning in a positive and cohesive way while accepting gay individuals as fully participating members. One of the strengths of the CAM rhetoric was the extent to which positions were justified within the assumptions of the vision. To fail to show how assertions fit within the context of the proffered perspective is to fail to show how the perspective can explain reality, hence to fail to create that alternative conception in an acceptable manner. It is in this arena that both Target City and SPCHR fell short.

In the CAM vision, allowing civil rights for gays was a fault which could have led to total destruction of the vision. Target City aimed at such destruction, ignoring the need to create an understandable alternative. SPCHR, in attempting to integrate change into the social structure, implied such change would not damage the fundamental core of the CAM vision but failed to show how that could be. Without an accompanying explanation, without showing how the SPCHR argument fit with the rhetorical vision of CAM, without even contending with the major components of the CAM vision, SPCHR's entire argument had to be rejected by CAM rhetors and supporters. By accepting it, those to whom the CAM vision made sense would have destroyed one way of knowing without having another to replace it.

ENDNOTES

[1]"Petition filed to force vote on gay rights law," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 1/18/78. Page numbers will be given where possible, however not all citations are complete because of incomplete references in the clipping service used (the Minnesota State Legislature clipping service). See also "St. Paul voters kill gay rights," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/26/78, p. 1. According to the elections bureau, the voter turnout (in terms of registered voters) in April 1978 was 10% greater than it had been in April 1976, the previous April general election.

[2]See, for example, Central States Speech Journal, Vol. 31 (winter 1980) in which the entire journal is given to questions regarding the rhetorical study of social movements.

[3]E.g., see Robert Freed Bales, Personality and Interpersonal Behavior, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston (1970) pp. 3-185; A.J.M. Sykes, "Myth and Attitude Change," Human Relations, 18 (1965) pp. 323-337, and "Myth in Communication," J. of Communication, 20 (1970) pp. 17-31; Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58 (1972), pp. 396-407; Robert Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 43 (1978) pp. 233-248, and "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 36 (1972) pp. 82-87; Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman, The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co. (1966), expecially pp. 99-100.

[4]See Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision," 1972.

[5]"Pro/Con: Gay Rights vs Repeal Law," St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch, 1/21/78, p. 1B & 12B; also CAM brochure.

[6]CAM rhetors in certain situations called upon the legitimization of God, but primarily in front of religious audiences already sharing the vision. This vision overall did not attempt to persuade others to join in a religious belief system per se.

[7]CAM ad "Whose Rights are Wrong?" St. Paul Dispatch, 4/11/78, p. 18F; see also Twin Cities Today, TV broadcast KSTP-TV, Minneapolis, MN, 4/3/78

[8]"Petition filed to force vote vs gay rights law," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 1/18/78; see also Mrs. Mary Clark, letter, St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/21/78; Lucille Radinzel, letter, "Motherhood," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/20/78.

[9]CAM brochure; see also CAM ad, St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/22/78, last page.

[10]Yvonne L. Pedro, letter, in "Pro/Con: Your Turn," St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch, 1/28/78, p. 12B.

[11]Repeal supporters' claims that children need protection from gays' sexual advances seemed to receive undue support from the timing and placement of newspaper articles published in the St. Paul press regarding alleged instances of same sex sexual molestation of children. No matter that these instances were alleged, they were still "proof" for participants in this part of the vision.

[12]CAM ad, St. Paul Dispatch, 3/27/78; see also CAM brochure; Knights of Columbus, St. Paul Council 397, resolution, CAM PR materials; W. McPheron, letter, "How gays took over San Francisco," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/17/78, p. 4.

[13]CAM brochure; also Rev. A.H. Braun, letter, CAM PR materials.

[14]Rabbinical Alliance of America, press release, CAM PR materials; see also "Burke hits Butler for 'bigotry,'" St. Paul Dispatch, 4/13/78, p. 31F; CAM ad, St. Paul Dispatch, 4/20/78, p. 26.

[15]Rabbinical Alliance of America, press release, CAM PR materials; also Knights of Columbus, St. Paul Council 397, resolution; Harvey Holman, letter, St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/20/78, p. 8; KSJN- radio broadcast, "Gay Rights Rallies," 4/20/78, Minnesota Public Radio, St. Paul, Minnesota; CAM PR materials; "Pro/Con: Gay Rights vs Repeal Law," St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch, 1/21/78, p. 1B & 12B; Yvonne L. Pedro, letter, in "Pro/Con: Your Turn," St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch, 1/28/78, p. 12B.

[16]Twin Cities Today, 4/3/78; Julie Sare, letter, "Homosexual power play," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/20/78, p. 10; W. Pherlon, letter, "Gay Activists," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/14/78, p. 6

[17]Julie Sare, letter, "Homosexual power play," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/29/78, p. 10; W. McPheron, letter, "How gays took over San Francisco," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/17/78, p. 4; see also A.D. Nelson, letter, "What will happen?" St. Paul Dispatch, 4/20/78, p. 10; Mary Aldrich, letter, and Randall J. Dion, letters in "Pro/Con: Your Turn," St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch, 1/28/78, p. 12B.

[18]V.L.Vawter, letter, "Mockery," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/17/78, p. 4.

[19]"Gays 'immoral,'" Election Guide Supplement, p. 9, Press/Dispatch, 4/21/78.

[20]That the tradition of civil rights in this country extends to religious belief--a choice--did not affect this conclusion. It was seldom brought to light in any of the discourse I studied.

[21]R. Johnson, letter, in "Pro/Con: Your Turn," St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch, 1/28/78, p. 12B.

[22]Marge Julkowski, letter, "Gay rights," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 3/27/78.

[23]SPCHR brochure, "Religious Support of Human Rights."

[24]Donald Arneson, letter, "Sell job," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/6/78, p. 10.

[25]"The non-issue that took over a city," editorial, St. Paul Pioneer Press/Dispatch, 1/28/78, p. 2F. This theme may be more appropriately placed as representing the Observer rhetoric, and some ambiguity of position is seen in this editorial. The sarcasm is similar to that seen in much of the Observer rhetoric.

[26]SPCHR ad, "Discrimination," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/20/78; Herbert C. Hayak, O.P., Dignity, letter in SPCHR PR materials; see also SPCHR ad, "Last four mayors," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/22/78, p. 12; Elizabeth Gilman, letter, St. Paul Pioneer Press, 3/18/78; SPCHR ad, "Discrimination, It's against the Law," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/21/78, p. 12; SPCHR ad, "Sure parents have rights," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/20/78, p. 6; SPCHR ad, "Have to fear," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/21/78.

[27]E.g., Michael R. Jefferis, letter to pastors, SPCHR PR materials, 3/13/78; "Group fights to keep rights act," St. Paul Dispatch, 1/19/78; Twin Cities Today, 4/3/78.

[28]"City 'target' of anti-gay forces says Miami man," Dispatch, 3/30/78, p. 31; see also "Gay rights activist, realtor, council hopefuls," St. Paul Dispatch, 1/19/78.

[29]Twin Cities Today, 4/3/78.

[30]See "Split hurts city 'gay' fight," St. Paul Dispatch, 4/6/78, p. 1-2; "Gay Rights Rallies," KSJN-radio, 4/20/78.

[31]Ibid; also "Competing rallies in Loop evidence of rift among gays," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/20/78, p. 11.

[32]Ibid; also "Human rights mixer engaging," St. Paul Pioneer Press, 4/10/78.

[33]See, e.g., Martin J. Medhurst, "The First Amendment vs. Human Rights: A Case Study in Community Sentiment and Argument from Definition," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46(1982),pp.1-19, in which the author describes a successful campaign to defeat a "Human Rights Initiative" aimed at providing specific protections for gay individuals. As described, the campaign against gay rights was strikingly similar to the non-religious parts of the CAM vision which proved so successful in St. Paul.

[34]Bormann, 1972, p.400.